

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

TROY ALAN STILLS,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT SIMPSON, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:20-CV-1099-PLC

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the fourth motion of self-represented Plaintiff Troy Alan Stills to submit discovery. [ECF No. 64]. For the following reasons, the motion will be denied.

On May 12, 2021, Plaintiff filed a document titled, “Motion to Submit Video – Partial Discovery – Requesting Service of Video to Defendants.” [ECF No. 55]. Plaintiff stated he was “notifying the Courts and Defendants that body-cam video footage [would] be sent to the Court” and asked the Court to accept it as “partial discovery.” On June 24, 2021, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motion pursuant to Local Rule 3.02(A), which instructs “discovery . . . shall not be filed with the Court except as exhibits to a motion or memorandum,” and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d)(1)(A), which prohibits the filing of discovery material “until [it is] used in the proceeding.” [ECF No. 59].

On July 1, 2021, Plaintiff filed two motions to file discovery with the Court. [ECF Nos. 60, 61]. Attached to Plaintiff’s motions were police reports and depositions from his underlying state criminal case, and a compact disc purporting to depict images of his alleged injuries. On July 13, 2021, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motions to submit evidence and struck the exhibits from the record. [ECF No. 63]. The Court again cited to Local Rule 3.02(A) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(d)(1)(A). Plaintiff was instructed that discovery requests are not to be filed with the

Court, but should instead be submitted between the parties. *See* Local Rule 3.02(A). Self-represented litigants, such as Plaintiff, must comply with the local and federal rules. *See e.g., American Inmate Paralegal Assoc. v. Cline*, 859 F.2d 59, 61 (8th Cir. 1988 (per curiam) (“Pro se litigants are not excused from complying with court orders or substantive and procedural laws”); *Clemons v. Lombardi*, Case No. 4:13-cv-458-CDP, 2014 WL 409107, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Feb 3, 2014) (citing *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 834-35, 834 n. 46 (1975)).

In the instant motion, Plaintiff again seeks to submit body-cam video footage with the Court. For the same reasons stated in the May 12, 2021 and July 1, 2021 Orders, Plaintiff’s motion will be denied.

Accordingly, after careful consideration,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion to Submit Evidence is **DENIED**. [ECF No. 64].



PATRICIA L. COHEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated this 9th day of September, 2021